

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 122

March 30, 1995, 6:32 p.m.
Page S-4895 Temp. Record

DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL-RESCISSIONS/GSA Buildings & Courthouses

SUBJECT: Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act . . . H.R. 1158. Hatfield motion to table the Kerrey/Cohen amendment No. 435 to the Hatfield substitute amendment No. 420.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE FAILED, 45-49

SYNOPSIS: As introduced, H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act, will provide \$5.360 billion in emergency appropriations for disaster assistance, and will rescind \$17.188 billion for various Departments and agencies.

The Hatfield substitute amendment would strike the provisions of H.R. 1158 and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 617, as reported, which would provide \$6.700 billion in disaster assistance (the amount requested by the President), would rescind \$13.286 billion for various Departments and agencies, and would provide for expedited salvage timber sales on Federal lands for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

The Kerrey/Cohen amendment would rescind an additional \$324.6 million for General Service Administration (GSA) Federal buildings and courthouse construction projects (the Hatfield substitute amendment would rescind \$241 million for those projects), including:

- \$121.9 million for the Federal building and U.S. Courthouse in Phoenix, Arizona;
- \$70 million for the Federal building and U.S. Courthouse in Tucson, Arizona;
- \$58 million for the Southeast Federal Center in the District of Columbia (in addition to the \$25 million proposed rescission in the substitute amendment); and
- \$26.3 million more for the U.S. Courthouse in Hammond, Indiana (in addition to the \$26 million proposed rescission in the substitute amendment).

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Hatfield moved to table the Kerrey amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: Following the failure of the motion to table, the Senate agreed to a Shelby second-degree substitute amendment to the

(See other side)

YEAS (45)			NAYS (49)			NOT VOTING (6)	
Republicans (33 or 65%)	Democrats (12 or 28%)		Republicans (18 or 35%)	Democrats (31 or 72%)		Republicans (3)	Democrats (3)
Bennett	Hatfield	Akaka	Abraham	Biden	Kerrey	Faircloth- ²	Baucus- ²
Bond	Hutchison	Bingaman	Ashcroft	Bradley	Kerry	Grams- ⁴	Conrad- ²
Burns	Kempthorne	Boxer	Brown	Breaux	Kohl	Kassebaum- ⁴	Dorgan- ²
Campbell	Kyl	Byrd	Chafee	Bryan	Lautenberg		
Coats	Lott	Feinstein	Cohen	Bumpers	Leahy		
Cochran	Lugar	Heflin	DeWine	Daschle	Levin		
Coverdell	Mack	Inouye	Gramm	Dodd	Lieberman		
Craig	McConnell	Johnston	Helms	Exon	Moseley-Braun		
D'Amato	Murkowski	Mikulski	Inhofe	Feingold	Nunn		
Dole	Packwood	Moynihan	Jeffords	Ford	Pell		
Domenici	Pressler	Murray	McCain	Glenn	Pryor		
Frist	Santorum	Sarbanes	Nickles	Graham	Reid		
Gorton	Shelby		Roth	Harkin	Robb		
Grassley	Specter		Simpson	Hollings	Rockefeller		
Gregg	Stevens		Smith	Kennedy	Simon		
Hatch	Thompson		Snowe		Wellstone		
	Thurmond		Thomas				
			Warner				

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Kerrey amendment, after which it was adopted by voice vote.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The substitute amendment would rescind \$241 million from GSA construction projects. Some of those rescissions have been proposed because they are for projects that have not been authorized by the Senate; some have been proposed on the GSA's recommendation; some have been proposed because they are for projects that have been delayed or canceled. The House, in contrast, proposed rescinding \$136.6 million for construction projects, the bulk of which have not been authorized by the House but have been authorized by the Senate. The proposed Senate rescissions, as even proponents of the Kerrey amendment have conceded, were selected with reason and with fairness to all Members. The same may not be true of the Kerrey amendment. While it would result in greater savings, we are not certain of the rational basis for its proposed rescissions. Accordingly, if this amendment is not tabled, we will offer an even larger substitute rescission proposal which we believe would be both fair and rational. We would prefer not to have to offer that amendment. Senators should not get into this bidding war. Most of the funds we are debating are for Federal courthouses. Our judicial system is already strained, making it difficult to prosecute and imprison felons. Cutting too heavily into these projects may hamper law enforcement efforts. We therefore urge our colleagues to table the Kerrey amendment, or we will be forced to propose a substitute amendment making greater cuts in the interest of fairness to all States.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The Kerrey amendment would rescind an additional \$324.6 million for GSA construction projects, primarily for courthouses. The list was devised using the GSA "time-out" review, which recommended the rescission of \$1.3 billion worth of projects. Some of those recommendations were adopted by the Kerrey amendment, and a few more rescissions that were not on the GSA list were included. In evaluating this amendment, Senators should keep two factors in mind: first, the deficit must be reduced; and second, cutting these projects would not result in hungry children, less defense funding, more homeless, or less educational aid. Fewer courthouses would be built, and money would be saved. Courthouses, quite frankly, are not a high-priority item. Senators should be delighted at the chance to save money relatively painlessly, and we trust therefore that they will join us in voting against the motion to table.